

# **Proposed Cultural Commission Grant Eligibility, Review and Scoring Changes**

*Dated June 2013*

## **1. Assign:**

A lead reviewer would be assigned to each grant application, responsibilities include:

- Individual would present the grant to the commission for review.
- Research beyond the application when applicable.
- Answer questions from the board in the event clarification is required, in deliberation.
- Identify “strengths” and “weaknesses” to the board regarding the application during deliberation.

## **2. Question and Answer:**

A.) At the beginning of the meeting **ALL** applicants would be invited for a Q+A session at the beginning of the meeting (restricted to 5-10 mins)

## **3. Deliberation:**

In a closed session to the applicants, the commission would openly discuss the applications.

- The lead reviewer would lead their applications’ deliberation.
- Members would openly discuss strengths and weaknesses of the application.
- Notes would be taken, bullet points in two categories, strengths and weaknesses. These notes would be made available to the public and returned to the applicant no matter the outcome.
- If a grant amount requested needs to be amended, for “partial funding” it occurs here, before moving on to the “scoring” phase.

## **4. Scoring:**

When a grant has finished deliberation, each commission member would be asked to assign a numerical value rating the grant application 1-5. A score of 1 represents a grant request of weak merit, a score of 5 represents a grant request of strong merit.

- Each member would be given a personal scoring sheet.
- Each voting members score(s) would be kept anonymous from other board members (if they wish)
- The score card must be initialed by the voting member

## **5. Evaluation:**

After all the grants have been reviewed, the score sheets will be collected and tallied, determining which grant requests will be funded.

- A cumulative average higher than “4” will be acknowledged as successful
- In the event that enough grant funds are not available, the highest cumulative average would determine successful grants
- If necessary, the process would be repeated beginning at “Deliberation” to determine successful grant awards.

## **Proposed Cultural Commission Grant Eligibility, Review and Scoring Changes**

### **Grant Criteria**

Below are guidelines that reflect the Commission's desired

- Displays a substantial level of artistic merit
- Public art/visibility
- Programming
- Historical funding levels (how much and how frequently has individual/organization been awarded funds)
- Assists in promoting Bangor as an arts capital
- Further promotes Bangor's creative-economy
- Showcases residents and resources of Bangor natives
- Shows an ability to be sustainable
- Demonstrates the capacity to complete the project
- Is open or accessible to the public
- The duration of the project
- Detailed marketing proposal of the event/performance

### **Grant Rules:**

- Large grant applications will be due (twice a year) May 1<sup>st</sup> and Nov 1<sup>st</sup>
- Smaller grants (below \$1,000) will have rolling admissions, grants received prior to 3 weeks before the next meeting will be reviewed, otherwise pushed to the next meeting
- Individuals are eligible to apply for grants up to \$1,000
- Individuals that receive funding will be reimbursed for eligible expenses only once the project is completed.
- Applicants must show a match of other funds of 100% (or 1 to 1)
- Organization/Individual may apply once every 12 months (w/ a recommendation that they do not apply in consecutive fiscal years)
- Displays a direct benefit to the residents of Bangor, or grant take place within city limits
- No funding will be provided to projects that have already occurred

The Commission will review these changes in a year to determine their effectiveness and to consider any necessary changes.